

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/690,937	10/22/2003	James C. Elliott	18111.0021U4	7696
23859	7590 10/11/20	1	EXAMINER	
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C. SUITE 1000 999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915			ROSENBAUM, MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/690,937	ELLIOTT, JAMES C.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Rosenbaum	3725			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value of the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the period of the	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 A	ugust 2005.	·			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.					
	,—				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-28 and 43-55</u> is/are 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) <u>29-42,56-58</u> is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.	withdrawn from consideration.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • •	` .			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application	on No			
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	<b>d.</b>			
Attachment(s)	•				
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
P) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) I) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 8/22/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no serious burden for the examiner to examine the non-elected groups. This is not found persuasive because the other Groups expand the necessary search such that it would be a burden for the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-28,43-55 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 8/22/05.

#### Specification

Applicants should note the disposition of the parent case in the specification.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 29,30,32-34,36-39,56,57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pierce (5947396). Pierce shows a horizontal hammermill having an

Application/Control Number: 10/690,937

Art Unit: 3725

upper inlet, lower outlet, a rotor assembly having a plurality of hammers, rings 66, and wear plates 58.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31,35,58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce in view of Jadouin. Pierce does not use spacers which may result in unwanted misalignment. Jadouin solves this problem by disclosing similar apparatus including the use of spacers 36. In order to properly align the hammers, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Pierce by providing spacers, taught to be desirable by Jadouin.

Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierce as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Graveman et al. Pierce does not show use of a grate which may result in large particles being able to escape prior to being comminuted. Graveman et al solves this problem by disclosing similar apparatus including the use ofd grate assemblies. In order to ensure proper material comminution, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Pierce by providing a grate assembly, taught to be desirable by Graveman et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/690,937

Art Unit: 3725

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 571-272-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Rosenbaum Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

MR